|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2022-2023** | | |
| *PCAL* | | *English* |
| *English (662)* | | |
| *Jeff Rice* | | |
| ***Is this an online program***?  Yes  No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here  Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. Add more Outcomes as needed.*** | | | |
| **SLO 1: Use one or more of the rhetorical appeals (logos, ethos, pathos) to successfully address a particular audience.** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Rhetoric courses (ENG 212, 301, 412) | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **SLO 2: Incorporate material from secondary sources to support an original analysis.** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | Student writing samples from Capstone courses (ENG 413, 414, 416) | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:** | | | |
| We will assess both SLOs again in the 2023-24 assessment cycle. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | **Use one or more of the rhetorical appeals (logos, ethos, pathos) to successfully address a particular audience.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from three Rhetoric courses (ENG 212: Digital Texts and Media; ENG 301: Argument and Analysis; ENG 412: Theory of Rhetoric and Persuasive Writing). This learning outcome falls under the department’s larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to successfully analyze argumentative techniques, and each rhetoric course assigned student writing that addressed this goal. | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The language in this rubric is freely adapted from the [AAC&U Value Rubrics](https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics) provided for us by the WKU ASL Office. Instead of creating prose for each possible nuance on a 5-point scale we have created a high, middle, and low-end target.  RUBRIC  5 (highest score) Demonstrates skillful use of appropriate rhetorical strategies to support the audience, purpose, and use  3 (middle score) Demonstrates an attempt to use appropriate rhetorical strategies, but does not consistently incorporate them well enough to support the audience, purpose, and use  1 (lowest score) Demonstrates an attempt to use rhetorical strategies, but does not incorporate them to support audience, purpose, and use  N/A Does not use rhetorical appeals to address a particular audience.  A score of 4 or higher is deemed to be successful. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 70% of student artifacts rated at 4 or higher, none at 3 or lower. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 73% received an average rating of 4 or higher, 0 received 3 or lower. | |
| **Methods** | 43 students across the three rhetoric courses (approx. 30% of total number of English majors) submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. A representative number of artifacts from each class (selected at random by assigning each student a code number, then using a random number generator) were made anonymous and evaluated independently by six faculty members using the rubric guidelines above. To assure that the same criteria were being applied across the major, each reviewer was given samples from all three courses. At least 35% of students in each of the courses were evaluated and included in the data. Scores were averaged across reviewers. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | |
| **Results**: This is the first year we’ve assessed this SLO, and we were very pleased to see such a strong success rate. While we understand that success in one sample year does not mean that this learning outcome does not merit continued attention, we feel that the department’s attention to analyzing arguments and rhetorical techniques over the past several years gives students a solid foundation as they move through the program.  **Conclusions:** We believe that part of this SLO’s success can be attributed to the variety of student samples evaluated. The scope of each of the rhetoric courses (ENG 212: Digital Texts and Media; ENG 301: Argument and Analysis; ENG 412: Theory of Rhetoric and Persuasive Writing) helps incrementally build the kinds of close reading, audience analysis, and application of persuasive techniques needed for our program. For example, while most scores were a 4 or higher, the quantity of successful scores increased in the 400-level course. We believe that this shows a strong sequential development of rhetorical skills.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Analyzing argumentative and persuasive techniques in a variety of genres is central to the mission of the English department and will remain in some form in any core list of SLOs. Following our discussion and potential revision of the core SLOs at our yearly fall retreat, we will assess this SLO again in the 2023-24 assessment cycle. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | **Incorporate material from secondary sources to support an original analysis.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Student writing samples appropriate for this learning outcome were gathered from all three English Capstone Courses (ENG 416: Literature Capstone; ENG 414: Professional Writing Capstone; and ENG 413: Creative Writing Capstone.) This learning outcome falls under the department’s larger goal in this cycle of assessment to evaluate the ability of students to successfully incorporate evidence into their writing, and each capstone course assigned student writing that addressed this goal. | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The language in this rubric is freely adapted from the [AAC&U Value Rubrics](https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics) provided for us by the WKU ASL Office. Instead of creating prose for each possible nuance on a 5-point scale we have created a high, middle, and low end target.  5 (highest score) Demonstrates skillful use of high quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas in support of an original analysis.  3 (middle score) Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources, but did not consistently incorporate them well to support an original analysis.  1 (lowest score) Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing, but did not incorporate them to support original analysis.  N/A = Does not attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.  A score of 4 or higher is deemed to be successful. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 70% of student artifacts rated at 4 or higher, none at 3 or lower. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 75% of student artifacts were rated at 4 or higher. Three (25%) were rated three or lower. | |
| **Methods** | 34 students across the three capstone courses (approx. 24% of total number of English majors) submitted a writing sample appropriate for this learning outcome. A representative number of artifacts from each class (selected at random by assigning each student a code number, then using a random number generator) were made anonymous and evaluated independently by six faculty members using the rubric guidelines above. To assure that the same criteria were being applied across the major, each reviewer was given samples from all three concentrations (Creative Writing, Professional Writing, Literature). At least 33% of students in each of the capstones (Lit, CW, PW) were evaluated and included in the data. Scores were averaged across reviewers. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | |
| **Results:** This was again a strong improvement from when we measured the same SLO in 2021-22. Though we achieved the upper end of our target we still have some student artifacts that show problems—some significant—in demonstrating this SLO. We will assess this again in the 2023-24 cycle, though it is possible the wording of the SLO may change following the potential revisions to the core English department SLOs.  **Conclusions**: The increased success rate from the 2021-22 cycle (70%) to this cycle (75%) can be attributed to our renewed efforts to better integrate this SLO in our Capstone courses. Students have shown incremental improvement in incorporating material from secondary sources as a result, and we will continue to support this SLO in the Capstone courses. However, such a high failure rate (25%) means that we will need to reexamine how we implement (and perhaps instruct) students in this SLO. Such discussions will be a part of our 2023-24 faculty retreat.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:** This will be assessed in the 2023-24 assessment cycle. | | | | | |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map (below/next page) as part of this document**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Requirement** | **Course Number and Title** | **LO1:**  **Understand explicitly the development and use of spoken and written language** | **LO2:**  **Analyze, interpret, and critically discuss a diverse variety of texts** | **LO3:**  **Analyze argumentative and persuasive techniques in a variety of genres** | **LO4:**  **Compose successfully in multiple genres, media, and formats** | **LO5:**  **Demonstrate a strong understanding of the history and development of literature in English in a global context** | **LO6:**  **Analyze a diverse variety of texts through multiple theories and histories** | **LO7:**  **Conduct academic research and document it appropriately** |
| Intro to Major | ENG 299: Introduction to English Studies |  | I | I | I | I | I | I |
| Grammar | ENG 204: English Language | I, M, A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing (1) | ENG 203: Intro to Creative Writing  ENG 306: Business Writing  ENG 307: Technical Writing  ENG 401: Advanced Composition  ENG 410: Comp. Theory & Practice |  |  | R | R |  |  |  |
| Rhetoric (1) | ENG 212: Intro to Digital Texts & Media  ENG 201: Argument and Analysis  ENG 412 Theories of Rhetoric and Persuasion | R |  | M | R |  | R |  |
| British & American Surveys (2) | ENG 381: Survey of British Literature I  ENG 382: Survey of British Literature II  ENG 391: Survey of American Literature I  ENG 392: Survey of American Literature II |  | R |  | R | R | R | R |
| World Literature | ENG 385: Studies in World Literature |  | R |  | R | R | R | R |
| Upper-Level Literature Elective (1) | Select one 300- or 400- level literature elective from the departmental offerings |  | M |  | R |  | R | R |
| Capstone (1) | ENG 413: Creative Writing Capstone  ENG 414: Professional Writing Capstone  ENG 416: Literature/EST Capstone |  | A | A | M, A | M, A | M, A | M, A |